

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/587,541	NASUNO ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	ALEXA D. NECKEL	1795	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) ALEXA D. NECKEL

(3) HYUNG SOHN

(2) SHANNON GARDNER

(4) SHUNSUKE TOMIOKA AND YOICHI HIRASHI

Date of Interview: 29 July 2010.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference  
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: pending claims and proposed claims (attached).

Identification of prior art discussed: art of record.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The examiners indicated that the proposed amendment (attached) overcomes the applied references - especially when viewing paragraph 0227 of the Wada reference. Upon the filing of a supplemental amendment, the search will be updated.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

ALEXA D. NECKEL  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Informal: For discussion only  
RE: Application 10/587,541  
Page 1 of 2

TO: Examiner Shannon GARDNER,  
571-270-5270 (voice), 571-270-6270 (fax)

FROM: Hyung Sohn, 703-816-4891 (voice), 703-816-4100 (fax)

RE: Application 10/587,541

Date: July 27, 2010

---

Examiner Gardner,

Thank you for agreeing to the interview to take place on Thursday, July 29, 2010, 10:30 AM at your location. FYI – Messrs. Youichi Hiraishi and Shunsuke Tomioka of Sharp Corporation, representatives of our client, will be joining the interview.

As I mentioned on the phone, we submitted an Amendment on June 3, 2010 in response to an Office Action dated March 3, 2010. As of the June 3<sup>rd</sup> Amendment, claims 11-15 and 25-43 are pending. Of these, claims 11 and 12 are independent.

We have learned that a corresponding Japanese application has been allowed, and our client wishes to make the US claims somewhat similar in scope. To that end, we propose to amend independent claims 11 and 12 as follows:

11. (Currently Amended) A photoelectric conversion device,

comprising:

a photoelectric conversion layer and a backside electrode layer stacked in this order on a structure, wherein

the structure comprises:

a substrate; and

a transparent electrode layer formed on at least a part of a surface region of the substrate, the transparent electrode layer

Informal: For discussion only  
RE: Application 10/587,541  
Page 2 of 2

having at least an opening portion within which the transparent electrode layer is absent.

12. (Currently Amended) A stacked photoelectric conversion device, comprising:

a plurality of photoelectric conversion layers and a backside electrode layer stacked in this order on a structure; and

a first intermediate layer sandwiched between at least a pair of adjacent two photoelectric conversion layers, wherein

the structure comprises:

a substrate; and

a first transparent electrode layer formed on at least a part of a surface region of the substrate, the first transparent electrode layer having at least an opening portion within which the first transparent electrode layer is absent.

We think the above amendments better defines what is meant by the "opening portion" and distinguishes over the combinations of cited references, which we will be happy to explain further at the interview.

The above proposed amendment, if acceptable, may necessitate claims 25 and 37 to be amended for consistency. We also propose to make similar amendments to claims 13 and 14 regarding opening portions of the intermediate layers.

If you have questions prior to the interview, please contact me and I will try my best to answer so that the interview itself can be efficient.

- Hyung Sohn

